1	DANIEL G. BOGDEN		
2	United States Attorney District of Nevada CRANE M. POMERANTZ		
3	CRISTINA D. SILVA Assistant United States Attorneys		
4	333 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 500 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101	U	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
6	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
8		Case No.2:11-cr-00347 KJD CWH	
9	Plaintiff,	Stipulation to Continue Response Date for Motions in Limine	
10	HENRI WETSELAAR, MD,	,))	
11)	

Defendant.

The United States, by and through the undersigned, defendant Henri Wetselaar, and his attorney, stipulate that the deadline for responding to the parties' motions *in limine*, currently set for April 1, 2016, be vacated and continued until May 17, 2016, or other date and time convenient to the Court. This stipulation is entered into for the following reasons:

- 1. On April 4, 2016, the parties appeared before the Court on the parties' Joint Motion to Continue Trial Date (Doc. No. 218). The Court indicated its intention to grant that motion and requested that the parties resubmit their request as a stipulation that expressly excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act. The parties did so that same day.
- 2. The Court indicated that it intended to reset the trial date until July 18, 2016. It also set a status conference on May 17, 2016 to address issues relating to defendant Wetselaar's competency.

1	3. Both parties filed motions <i>in limine</i>	pursuant to the Court's previously imposed	
2	deadline. The defendant responded in timely fashio	on to the one motion in limine filed by the	
3	United States. The United States has not yet responded to the various motions in limine filed by		
4	the defendant or filed its reply to the defendant's response to its motion in limine. The parties		
5	are jointly requesting that the Court reset its deadline for responses to the pending motions until		
6	May 17, 2016, approximately six weeks prior to the start of trial, and the date of its status		
7	conference. The parties are jointly requesting that the Court reset its deadline for replies to the		
8	responses until May 24, 2016.		
9		Respectfully submitted,	
10		DANIEL G. BOGDEN United States Attorney	
11		Office States Attorney	
12	/s/	/s/	
13	JEFFREY SETNESS Counsel for defendant Wetselaar	CRISTINA D. SILVA CRANE M. POMERANTZ	
14	Counsel for defendant wetseraar	Assistant United States Attorney	
15	Dated: April 4, 2016		
16	Dated: April 4, 2010		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

-oOo-

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs.	Case No.2:11-cr-00347 KJD CWH Stipulation to Continue Response Date for Motions in Limine
HENRI WETSELAAR, MD,)
Defendant.)) _)

Based on the pending Stipulation of counsel, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court finds that:

- 1. On April 4, 2016, the parties appeared before the Court on the parties' Joint Motion to Continue Trial Date (Doc. No. 218). The Court indicated its intention to grant that motion and requested that the parties resubmit their request as a stipulation that expressly excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act. The parties did so that same day.
- 2. The Court indicated that it intended to reset the trial date until July 18, 2016. It also set a status conference on May 17, 2016 to address issues relating to defendant Wetselaar's competency.

3. Both parties filed motions *in limine* pursuant to the Court's previously imposed deadline. The defendant responded in timely fashion to the one motion *in limine* filed by the United States. The United States has not yet responded to the various motions *in limine* filed by the defendant or filed its reply to the defendant's response to its motion *in limine*. The parties are jointly requesting that the Court reset its deadline for responses to the pending motions until May 17, 2016, approximately six weeks prior to the start of trial, and the date of its status conference. The parties are jointly requesting that the Court reset its deadline for replies to the responses until May 24, 2016.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The ends of justice served by granting said continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant, since the failure to grant said continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice, would deny the parties to adequately argue pretrial motions, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties' shall file their responses to pending motions *in limine* on May 17, 2016, and shall file their replies to those responses on May 24, 2016.

DATED: this 25th day of April, 2016.

THE HONORABLE KENT J. DAWSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE